DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 993 JC 840 506

AUTHOR Selby, James
TITLE Jefferson College Student Services Program Inventory.
INSTITUTION Jefferson Coll., Hillsboro, Mo.
PUB DATE 1 Dec 83
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Ancillary School Services; Community Colleges; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; School Surveys; Student Attitudes; *Student Needs; *Student Personnel Services; Student Personnel Workers; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted at Jefferson College to elicit opinions from a variety of groups as to the importance and effectiveness of 24 student services functions. Questionnaires were administered to 13 administrators, 23 classified staff, 84 faculty, 90 students, and 19 student services staff, asking them to indicate which of the 24 student services functions were being performed at the college, the importance of each function, and how effectively it was being carried out. Study findings, based on responses from 100% of the administrators, 70% of the classified staff, 51% of the faculty, 43% of the students, and 95% of the student services staff, included the following: (1) student placement was considered the most important function and was seen as being carried out effectively; (2) transfer counseling was rated as second in importance, but only fifteenth in effectiveness; (3) financial aid and registration were seen to be important and effectively carried out; (4) academic advisement and career counseling were considered to be quite important, yet both were rated low in terms of their effectiveness; and (5) counseling and advisement areas in general were considered to be quite important and to need the greatest amount of improvement to raise their effectiveness ratings. The bulk of the report consists of a detailed breakdown of study findings by student services function, reporting responses by group, and offering comments. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Selby
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED247993

JC 840 506

JEFFERSON COLLEGE
STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM INVENTORY

BY

JAMES SELBY
DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES

DECEMBER 1, 1983

JEFFERSON COLLEGE
STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM INVENTORY

This study was conducted to elicit opinions from a variety of groups as to the importance and effectiveness of twenty-four student services functions. The study was modeled after one done by Ron Shade as a doctoral dissertation at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, in 1982. In his study Shade asked the chief college administrator, chief academic officer, and the chief student services officer to complete his survey; then the results among these three groups were compared. At Jefferson College we asked five groups to complete the survey instrument; these five groups were administrator, classified staff, faculty, student, and student services staff. The chart below indicates the number of persons in each category who were asked to complete the questionnaire, the number who actually completed it, and the percentage of completion.

GROUP	NUMBER SENT	NUMBER COMPLETED	PERCENTAGE COMPLETED
Administrators	13	13	100%
Classified Staff	23	16	70%
Faculty	84	51	61%
Students	90	39	43%
Student Services Staff	19	18	95%

The questionnaires were distributed through campus mail or the appropriate dean to all except the student group. For the student group a random selection process was used to select 90 sophomores to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were mailed to students and distributed to staff during the week of August 29th through September 2nd. All participants were encouraged to return the questionnaires within two weeks, at which time the results were tallied. Twenty-four student services functions were listed and respondents were asked to indicate whether the function was being provided at Jefferson College, the importance of that function, and how effectively that function was being carried out. The four categories for importance were: unimportant, somewhat unimportant, important, and very important while the categories for effectiveness were: ineffective, somewhat ineffective, effective, very effective. A copy of the inventory is listed as Appendix A to this report. It is obvious that the second category for importance should be "somewhat unimportant," rather than "somewhat important," to be consistent with the effectiveness categories.

Obvious limitations of the study include the fact that only 43% of the students responded and that we were working with very small numbers in some categories; however, the results are meaningful and have been and will continue to be used in modifying student services objectives.

For analyzing each of the twenty-four functions we collapsed the top two ratings for the importance and effectiveness evaluations. Doing this allowed us to rank the importance and effectiveness categories; these are shown in Table A. Following Table A are comments on Table A. These comments are followed by an analysis of each of the twenty-four functions.

TABLE A

Rankings of importance and effectiveness categories according to percent of respondents who indicated important or very important on the importance categories and effective or very effective on the effectiveness categories.

Rankings Total

Rank	Importance		Effectiveness
1	Placement.....96	4	Registration.....84
2	Transfer Counseling.....95	15	Financial Aid.....83
3	Financial Aid.....94	2	Records.....82
4	Registration.....94	1	Placement.....80
5	Academic Advisement.....92	18	Study Skills.....79
6	Senior College Relations.92	6	Senior College Relations...75
7	Career Counseling.....91	16	High School Relations.....75
8	Records.....90	3	Orientation.....72
9	Program Evaluation.....90	13	Student Activities.....67
10	High School Relations....89	7	Veterans Service.....66
11	Study Skills.....89	5	Recruitment.....66
12	Testing.....88	12	Testing.....63
13	Recruitment.....87	11	Program Evaluation.....63
14	Personal Counseling.....85	20	Discipline.....61
15	Staff Development.....83	21	Transfer Counseling.....59
16	Orientation.....81	8	Career Counseling.....58
17	Discipline.....80	14	Human Devel. Workshop.....57
18	Institutional Research...77	22	Academic Advising.....55
19	Human Devel. Workshop....77	17	Student Government.....50
20	Student Government.....75	19	Personal Counseling.....47
21	Veterans Service.....75	10	Staff Development.....47
22	Student Activities.....72	9	Institutional Research.....34
23	Health Service.....62	23	Health Service.....27
24	Housing.....55	24	Housing.....25

On the basis of the chart it is obvious that placement is considered important and effective. Transfer counseling, rated second in importance, is only rated 15th in effectiveness. Financial aid is considered important and effective, as is registration. Academic advisement is considered quite important, yet it falls to 18th position in effectiveness. Senior college relations is 6th in both importance and effectiveness. Career counseling is considered quite important, yet it too falls low in effectiveness, ranking 16th. The records area is considered important and effective, as are high school relations and study skills. Testing ranks 12th in both importance and effectiveness. Recruitment is still considered rather important, yet it ranks 11th in terms of effectiveness. Staff development is considered rather important; it ranks 21st in effectiveness. Orientation, while 16th in importance is still considered rather important and ranks 8th in terms of effectiveness. Discipline is considered somewhat important and somewhat effective. Institutional research is considered somewhat important but quite ineffective. Human development workshops and courses are considered somewhat important but only moderately effective. Student government is considered somewhat important and about average in terms of effectiveness. Veterans services are considered moderately important but fare considerably better in terms of effectiveness, placing 10th in overall effectiveness. Student activities are considered somewhat important and scored quite high (9th place) in terms of effectiveness. Health services are not considered important and are rated as quite ineffective. Housing is considered as average in importance and well below average in effectiveness.

Obviously the counseling and advisement areas, which are all considered important or very important, need the greatest amount of improvement in order to improve their effectiveness ratings. On the other hand, those areas which are more data oriented did very well on the effectiveness categories and are considered important by various groups.

In addition to Table A we have included the results for each function. Readers may draw their own conclusions from the data, but generally it appears to support an improvement of services in the counseling and advisement areas and some type of decision by the College personnel as to the future direction of health services and housing.

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 1 - HIGH SCHOOL RELATIONS

(building cooperative relationships with area secondary schools)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0		0	0	15	85		0	23	69	8
Classified Staff	88	6	6	3	8	8	53	31	1	0	20	60	20
Faculty	90	1	9	3	2	11	41	46	7	5	31	57	7
Students	85	0	15		0	8	52	42	2	0	11	68	21
Student Services Staff	94	0	6		6	6	35	53	2	0	33	60	7
Total	89	1	10	6	2	9	42	47	12	1	24	62	13

Note:

There is consistency among all groups as to the importance of the high school relations functions; however, faculty and Student Services staff do not rate the effectiveness of this area nearly as high as do students, classified staff, and administrators.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 2 - STUDENT RECRUITMENT

(attracting students to the community college)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0		0	8	0	92		0	38	54	8
Classified Staff	94	0	6	1	13	13	7	67		7	27	47	19
Faculty	99	0	1	1	4	4	22	70		6	30	52	12
Students	77	0	23		8	5	62	25		5	30	51	14
Student Services Staff	100	0	0	1	0	13	13	74		0	19	69	12
Total	92	0	8	3	6	7	28	59		5	29	53	13

Note:

Classified staff rate the importance of this function considerably lower than do the other four groups. On the otherhand, as to effectiveness, the Student Services staff rates the effectiveness considerably higher than do the other groups. Two-thirds of the entire respondents rate the overall effectiveness as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 3 - ORIENTATION

(introducing students to campus programs, facilities, personnel, etc.)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	92	0	8	1	8	0	67	25	1	0	42	42	16
Classified Staff	100	0	0		13	6	25	56		6	13	50	31
Faculty	100	0	0		0	21	34	45	2	4	33	51	12
Students	85	3	12		3	13	38	46		0	18	44	38
Student Services Staff	94	0	6	1	0	18	53	29	2	0	25	69	6
Total	94	1	5	2	4	15	39	42	5	2	26	50	22

Note:

There is strong support for the importance of orientation with eight out of ten respondents indicating the area is important or very important. Classified staff and students rate the effectiveness considerably higher than faculty and administrators. Almost 3/4 of the total sample rate the effectiveness as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 4 - ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

(assisting students in academic program and course selection)

	% Provided				% Importance					% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	# NA	1	2	3	4	# NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0	2	9	0	0	91		7	54	32	7
Classified Staff	94	0	6	2	14	14	7	65	1	6	47	41	6
Faculty	96	2	2	1	4	0	16	80	2	12	45	35	8
Students	96	2	2		2	2	27	69		5	28	46	21
Student Services Staff	100	0	0		0	6	17	77	2	0	12	81	7
Total	96	2	2	5	5	3	16	76	5	8	37	44	11

Note:

Of the twenty-four student services functions advisement is rated fifth in importance by the respondents. Only classified staff give less than a 90% important/very important rating to this function. As for effectiveness, only the Student Services staff gives this function a vote of confidence, although 2/3 of the students rate this function as effective or very effective. Less than 50% of the administrators, classified staff, and faculty rate this area as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 5 - REGISTRATION

(enrolling students in classes)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0		8	0	15	77	1	0	8	67	25
Classified Staff	94	0	6	1	13	13	20	54	1	13	13	40	34
Faculty	100	0	0	3	4	2	25	69	2	12	12	57	19
Students	82	0	18	2	3	0	19	78	1	3	5	63	29
Student Services Staff	100	0	0	1	0	0	17	83	2	0	6	81	13
Total	94	0	6	7	4	2	21	73	7	7	9	61	23

Note:

Only 74% of classified staff rate this function as important or very important, while no less than 92% of the other four groups rate this area as important or very important. As for effectiveness, the registration function rates first in overall effectiveness with 84% of the respondents rating this function as effective or very effective. Over 90% of the administrators, students, and Student Services staff rate the function as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY:

NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 6 - EDUCATIONAL TESTING

(assessing basic skills, academic course proficiency, GED, etc.)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	92	0	8		8	0	46	46	1	0	8	58	34
Classified Staff	88	6	6	1	0	7	60	33	1	7	20	66	7
Faculty	84	0	16	3	4	6	42	48	11	0	43	48	9
Students	82	0	18	2	3	5	46	46	5	6	24	44	26
Student Services Staff	83	0	17	2	0	37	19	44	1	0	67	27	6
Total	85	1	14	8	3	9	43	45	19	3	34	47	16

Note:
The Student Services staff rates this function significantly lower in importance than do the other four groups. This finding is similar to other studies concerning the importance of testing. Student Services professionals especially tend to downplay the role of testing because they realize the errors of measurement inherent in any testing. As for effectiveness, the Student Services staff does not feel testing is effective or very effective; in fact, 2/3 of the staff feels that testing is somewhat ineffective or ineffective. Interestingly, 92% of the administrators rate the testing services as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY:

NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 7 - FINANCIAL AID

(providing financial information, advisement, part-time jobs, etc.)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0	1	8	0	25	67	2	0	0	55	45
Classified Staff	94	0	6	1	7	0	53	40	1	7	20	40	33
Faculty	98	0	2	2	2	2	31	65	4	2	13	64	21
Students	95	0	5		3	3	28	66	2	8	19	32	41
Student Services Staff	100	0	0	1	6	6	41	47	1	0	6	65	29
Total	97	0	3	5	4	2	33	61	10	4	13	51	32

Note:
There was near unanimous agreement on the importance of financial aid with 94% of the respondents indicating important or very important for this function. In fact, financial aid ranks third overall of the twenty-four functions ranked. As for the effectiveness, 83% of the respondents indicated effective or very effective for this area. Students and classified staff rank this area significantly lower than do administrators, faculty, and Student Services staff. These results tend to agree with other national and regional studies since students typically do not rate financial aid high, especially if they are not receiving any financial aid. However, the fact that such a high percentage of the groups ranked financial aid as effective or very effective indicates general satisfaction with this area.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 8 - RECORDS MAINTENANCE

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	92	0	3	2	9	0	18	73	2	9	27	18	46
Classified Staff	94	0	6		6	0	38	56		6	13	68	13
Faculty	98	0	2	2	4	2	37	57		4	6	53	37
Students	75	0	25	4	3	14	26	57	4	3	20	46	31
Student Services Staff	100	0	0	1	0	12	29	59	2	0	25	63	12
Total	92	0	8	9	4	6	31	59	8	4	15	51	30

Note:

Surprisingly, students do not rate the importance of this function as high as do the other four groups. However, 90% of the respondents indicate that this function is important or very important, placing it eighth of the twenty-four functions listed. It also ranks very high in effectiveness with 81% of the respondents indicating the area is effective or very effective. Only the administrators rate this area low; at least 75% of the other groups rate the function as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 9 - STUDENT ACTIVITIES

(providing student center cultural events, intramurals, clubs, etc.)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0	1	8	17	58	17	1	8	34	50	8
Classified Staff	94	0	6	1	0	40	53	7	3	8	23	69	0
Faculty	98	0	2		0	25	55	20	1	4	28	58	10
Students	97	0	3	1	0	26	45	29	2	3	22	40	35
Student Services Staff	100	0	0		6	22	72	0	2	6	38	56	0
Total	98	0	2	3	2	26	54	18	9	4	29	53	14

Note:

There is general agreement as to the importance of student activities with 72% of the respondents indicating this function is important or very important. This result tends to be higher than similar studies at other institutions, which may reflect the College's past commitments to student activities. As for effectiveness, two out of three respondents rate this function as effective or very effective. Those rating the function lower than average are administrators and Student Services staff, whereas 3/4 of the students rate this function as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 10 - VETERANS' SERVICES

(providing veterans with an array of personalized counseling services)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	92	0	8	3	10	20	60	10	4	0	56	44	0
Classified Staff	81	0	19		0	27	33	40	2	0	28	58	14
Faculty	88	0	12	5	0	19	61	20	9	0	26	64	10
Students	49	5	46	11	4	14	46	36	15	4	21	50	25
Student Services Staff	88	0	12	2	0	50	31	19	3	-	53	33	7
Total	77	1	22	21	2	23	49	26	33	2	32	54	12

Note:
There is general agreement on the importance of veterans services, with the exception of the Student Services staff where only 50% of the staff rate this function as important or very important. Student Services staff may be the only personnel aware of the tremendous drop in veteran enrollment, with less than 150 veterans currently taking classes at Jefferson College and that number expected to shrink to less than 75 by 1986. As for effectiveness , two-thirds of the respondents rate this function as effective or very effective with administrators and Student Services staff rating the function below average and students, faculty, and classified staff rating it considerably above average. Two respondents who commented on the service indicated that they rated it down because of a lack of specialized counseling for veterans, not because of the way paperwork on veterans is handled. Also interesting is the fact that 30 respondents, 18 of them students, are not sure the function exists.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 11 - HUMAN DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS/COURSES

(providing self-improvement and life planning instruction)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	46	8	46	1	8	8	58	26	4	44	22	34	0
Classified Staff	50	6	44	2	0	7	71	22	6	0	30	60	10
Faculty	53	8	39	7	4	23	57	16	24	15	19	56	10
Students	57	0	43	7	0	16	47	37	10	2	26	45	17
Student Services Staff	33	28	39	3	0	47	40	13	5	31	46	23	0
Total	50	8	42	20	2	21	54	23	49	15	28	47	10

Note:

The results of this question are quite interesting; since human development workshops/courses is not fully explained it is difficult to determine what respondents used as a criteria for rating this function. Compared to other functions it is not rated as high, especially by Student Services staff. However, 85% of the students and administrators and 93% of classified staff feel this function is important or very important. Thus, it appears that Student Services staff may have to reevaluate the importance of this function. Less than 100 respondents gave a rating for effectiveness and roughly half of the respondents do not know this function exists.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 12 - TRANSFER STUDENT COUNSELING

(assisting transfer students in planning senior college programs)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	92	0	8	1	8	8	25	59	1	0	42	50	8
Classified Staff	75	0	25	2	0	7	36	57	4	8	50	34	8
Faculty	84	2	14	4	4	2	38	56	10	12	34	54	0
Students	72	2	26	3	0	0	31	69	6	9	21	55	15
Student Services Staff	78	0	22	2	0	6	56	38	2	0	37	44	19
Total	80	1	19	12	2	3	37	58	23	8	33	50	9

Note:

There was strong support for the importance of this function with 95% of the respondents rating this function important or very important, placing it second only to placement in importance. There is considerable disagreement as to the effectiveness of this area, however. While 70% of the students indicate this area is effective or very effective only 54% of the faculty, 58% of the administrators, and 42% of classified staff feel this is so. Overall, 59% of the respondents rate this function as effective or very effective, placing it in the middle in terms of effectiveness.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 13 - STUDENT DISCIPLINE

(regulating on-campus student conduct)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	85	0	15	2	9	0	46	45	3	30	20	50	0
Classified Staff	75	0	25	1	7	13	40	40	4	25	17	41	17
Faculty	75	6	19	4	4	17	36	43	12	16	18	51	15
Students	72	3	25	5	6	9	47	38	8	7	19	49	25
Student Services Staff	78	0	22	5	8	31	38	23	6	0	75	25	0
Total	75	3	22	17	6	14	41	39	33	14	25	46	15

Note:
The importance of student discipline is certainly not unanimous among the 5 groups, with only 61% of the Student Services staff considering this function important or very important, while 91% of the administrators consider this function important or very important. Interestingly enough, 85% of the students consider this function important or very important, which may explain why Jefferson College has so few discipline problems. As for the effectiveness of the disciplinary function there is also disagreement with only 25% of the Student Services staff rating it as effective or very effective, whereas 74% of the students rate it as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 14 - HEALTH SERVICES

(providing students with healthful living information and guidance)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	31	38	31	3	20	10	60	10	7	50	33	17	0
Classified Staff	19	6	75	5	0	27	46	27	12	0	100	0	0
Faculty	42	22	36	14	14	27	40	19	28	35	30	30	5
Students	3	5	57	13	4	35	38	23	18	14	52	24	10
Student Services Staff	17	28	5	4	8	38	23	31	10	63	25	12	0
Total	34	18	48	39	9	29	41	21	75	31	42	22	5

Note:
It must be noted that health services are practically nonexistent at Jefferson College. Only 62% of the respondents feel this area is important or very important, and less than 100 respondents rated health services as to effectiveness, with all of them rating effectiveness extremely low. In fact, none of the classified staff rate this area as effective or very effective and only 27% of the respondents rate this area as effective or very effective. It appears from the results and written comments that there is general agreement that while this service is not very important perhaps more should be done in providing emergency health services for Jefferson College students.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY:

NA - no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 15 - CAREER COUNSELING

(providing career planning information and guidance)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	54	38	8	1	8	0	8	84	1	0	42	50	8
Classified Staff	94	0	6	2	0	0	50	50	2	7	36	50	7
Faculty	92	0	8	1	6	6	42	46	7	2	41	45	12
Students	95	0	5	1	2	3	37	58	2	11	30	38	21
Student Services Staff	94	0	6	2	0	13	56	31	3	0	4	50	0
Total	90	4	6	7	4	5	40	51	15	5	37	46	12

Note:

Career counseling ranks seventh of the twenty-four functions in terms of importance with 91% of the respondents rating this area as important or very important. In fact, there is very little variance among the five groups as to the importance of career counseling. The effectiveness ratings for this area are rather low with very good consistency among all five groups and an overall 58% rating as effective or very effective. Obviously this is a function of Student Services that needs some rather immediate attention.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 16 - OFF-CAMPUS HOUSING

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	54	38	8	2	9	18	64	9	4	56	33	11	0
Classified Staff	19	56	25	3	8	31	46	15	8	25	62	13	0
Faculty	33	47	20	9	26	29	31	14	20	55	23	19	3
Students	21	21	58	15	4	38	33	25	20	26	26	37	11
Student Services Staff	39	39	22	6	25	25	33	17	9	44	44	0	12
Total	31	39	30	33	16	29	37	18	61	43	32	20	5

Note:

There is general agreement among all five sub-groups that housing is only moderately important and that what is presently being done is not very effective. Only 55% of the respondents indicate that housing was important or very important; even the student group does not rate this as a very important area. As for effectiveness, only 25% of the respondents feel the college is effective or very effective in this area. Since an ad hoc committee on housing is already working on this project perhaps some solutions to the effectiveness issues can be found.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 17 - PERSONAL COUNSELING

(assisting students in personal decision making and problem solving)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	77	0	23	1	8	8	34	50	3	20	40	40	0
Classified Staff	69	0	31	2	0	14	57	29	4	17	42	33	8
Faculty	65	12	23	8	5	2	53	40	13	8	42	39	11
Students	64	3	33	6	3	15	24	58	10	14	34	24	28
Student Services Staff	78	0	22	2	13	13	20	54	4	14	43	36	7
Total	68	5	27	19	6	9	39	46	36	13	40	33	14

Note:

Compared to other studies of community colleges student services programs there is surprising support among all five groups for personal counseling, with 85% of the respondents indicating personal counseling is an important or very important function. However, less than half of the respondents (47%) rate the function as effective or very effective. It should be pointed out that one's personal definition of "personal counseling" affects their opinions of the importance and effectiveness of personal counseling at Jefferson College.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY:

NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 18 - STUDENT GOVERNMENT

(providing for participatory campus governance by students)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	100	0	0		8	23	54	15		16	38	38	8
Classified Staff	94	0	6		6	12	70	12	2	0	43	50	7
Faculty	98	0	2		2	27	47	24	4	17	34	34	15
Students	85	0	15	2	3	16	44	37	6	9	30	43	18
Student Services Staff	94	0	6	1	0	31	50	19	2	13	56	25	6
Total	93	0	7	3	3	22	50	25	14	13	37	37	13

Note:

While 75% of the respondents feel that student government is important or very important, there is considerable variance among groups. Only 60% of the Student Services staff and administrators rated this as important or very important, whereas 81% of the students and 82% of the classified staff rated this area as important or very important. The effectiveness ratings are also diverse with 61% of the students rating this area as effective or very effective, whereas only 31% of the Student Services staff rated this area as effective or very effective. Certainly the ratings of student government reflect the previous year's student government and bear no reflection on the present year's student government.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY:

NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 19 - PLACEMENT

(assisting students in obtaining full-time employment)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	92	0	8	1	0	0	17	83	1	8	8	58	26
Classified Staff	88	0	12	1	0	0	7	93	2	0	14	57	29
Faculty	96	0	4	5	4	2	39	55	5	0	19	57	24
Students	79	0	21	4	0	3	17	80	6	9	24	49	18
Student Services Staff	100	0	0	1	0	0	53	47	1	0	6	53	41
Total	90	0	10	12	2	2	28	68	15	3	17	54	26

Note:

There is very little disagreement on placement, either in importance or effectiveness, with 96% of the respondents rating this as important or very important. This high response makes placement the number one priority. In fact, Student Services, administrators, and classified staff all rate this function 100% as being important or very important. In terms of effectiveness the overall effectiveness rating of placement is fourth, with 80% of the respondents indicating this area is effective or very effective. The only group falling below that percentage is the student group. A few students commented that they have not used the service because they are not occupational students. This could have influenced the results.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 20 - STUDY-SKILLS INSTRUCTION

(providing basic academic and study-skills tutoring and instruction)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	76	16	8	1	8	0	34	58	3	0	0	50	50
Classified Staff	82	6	12	1	0	13	40	47	2	7	7	60	26
Faculty	80	8	12	7	5	7	36	52	7	16	9	52	23
Students	82	0	18	4	3	5	29	63	6	3	12	61	24
Student Services Staff	61	11	28	5	8	8	38	46	5	15	31	31	23
Total	78	7	15	18	4	7	34	55	22	10	11	53	26

Note:

Student Services area does not provide study-skills instruction as such, however, the Learning Center does provide such services, and Student Services personnel work closely with the Learning Center personnel in seeing that these services are provided. There is rather consistent agreement that study-skills instruction is important with 89% rating this area as important or very important. Also, 79% rated this area as effective or very effective, with the Student Services area not rating it as high as the other groups, and the administrators giving it a 100% rating as being effective or very effective. Comments on the Student Services effectiveness ratings indicate they rated it low because of lack of student use of the service rather than the effectiveness of the service.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 21 - SENIOR COLLEGE RELATIONS

(building cooperative relationships with senior colleges)

	% Provided			% Importance					% Effectiveness				
	Y	N	U	# NA	1	2	3	4	# NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	85	0	15		0	0	38	62	3	0	20	80	0
Classified Staff	44	0	56	2	0	0	21	79	7	0	34	55	11
Faculty	98	0	2	8	2	7	37	54	18	9	12	70	9
Students	51	3	46	8	0	7	32	61	14	4	20	68	8
Student Services Staff	72	0	28	3	0	14	36	50	5	8	33	51	8
Total	74	1	25	21	2	6	34	58	47	5	20	66	9

Note:
There is strong report for the importance of senior college relations with 92% of the respondents rating it as important or very important, making this function fifth in importance of the twenty-four functions listed. Somewhat surprisingly, less than 100 respondents rated the function on effectiveness. There are considerable differences as to how effective this function is being performed. While 75% of the respondents rate it as effective or very effective, placing it sixth in effectiveness, only 59% of the Student Services staff feel this area is effective or very effective, whereas 79% of the faculty and 80% of the administrators rate this area as effective or very effective.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY:

NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 22 - INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

(providing periodic data on student body characteristics)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	54	23	23	2	9	18	27	46	5	50	25	25	0
Classified Staff	25	6	69	6	0	10	80	10	10	17	33	50	0
Faculty	53	14	33	14	0	16	59	25	20	23	42	25	10
Students	28	0	72	15	4	38	38	20	23	12	50	19	19
Student Services Staff	39	11	50	6	0	17	33	50	7	18	64	9	9
Total	41	9	50	43	2	21	49	28	65	22	44	24	10

Note:
While this function is not rated as high as some others, 77% do feel this function is important or very important with students giving a 58% important or very important rating, while faculty and Student Services staff give it better than 80% important or very important rating. As for effectiveness, it ranks third from the bottom of the twenty-four functions with only 34% of the respondents indicating the function is effective or very effective. Since institutional research is not strictly a Student Services function there may be a need for an institution-wide committee to look at the College's institutional research needs.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 23 - STUDENT SERVICES STAFF DEVELOPMENT

(providing opportunities and incentives for student personnel staff members growth)

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	31	23	46	4	0	11	33	56	8	20	40	40	0
Classified Staff	25	0	75	7	0	22	56	22	11	0	40	60	0
Faculty	31	6	63	21	0	20	53	27	30	24	33	29	14
Students	34	5	59	14	4	12	48	36	17	0	36	41	23
Student Services Staff	22	67	11	2	12	0	38	50	8	67	11	11	11
Total	30	15	55	48	3	14	47	36	74	21	32	33	14

Note:

Not surprisingly, less than 100 respondents rate staff development as an issue with 83% of those respondents indicating that this is an important or very important function. In terms of effectiveness 47% feel this function is effective or very effective. Interestingly, only 22% of the Student Services staff feel that Student Services staff development is effective or very effective, making this function an obvious area of concern for improvement.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective

SUMMARY OF
STUDENT SERVICES EVALUATION
September, 1983

QUESTION # 24 - STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM EVALUATION

	% Provided			#	% Importance				#	% Effectiveness			
	Y	N	U	NA	1	2	3	4	NA	1	2	3	4
Administrators	54	23	23	3	0	10	50	40	6	14	43	29	14
Classified Staff	56	0	44	3	0	15	31	54	7	0	34	44	22
Faculty	61		33	20	5	3	58	33	20	13	32	45	10
Students	56	3	41	8	3	6	36	55	13	8	8	42	42
Student Services Staff	50	33	17	2	6	6	44	44	7	27	27	46	0
Total	57	9	34	36	4	6	45	45	53	12	25	43	20

Note:

90% of the respondents feel this area is important or very important, placing it eighth among the twenty-four functions. There is general agreement among all five groups that this is an important area. As for effectiveness it also ranks twelfth in effectiveness with only the administrators and Student Services staff giving it less than 50% effective or very effective rating. It should be pointed out that only 84 respondents completed this rating of effectiveness.

For Importance and Effectiveness categories the number of persons not completing those categories are noted under the #NA column. All other figures are percentages.

KEY: NA = no answer

Provided
- Y = yes
- N = no
- U = uncertain

Importance
- 1 = unimportant
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

Effectiveness
- 1 = ineffective
- 2 = somewhat ineffective
- 3 = effective
- 4 = very effective